



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/568,820	11/17/2006	Andreas Reineke	06-135	7154
20306	7590	09/23/2008	EXAMINER	
MCDONNELL BOEHNEN HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP			HUERTA, ALEXANDER Q	
300 S. WACKER DRIVE			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
32ND FLOOR			2623	
CHICAGO, IL 60606				
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/23/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/568,820	REINEKE, ANDREAS	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	ALEXANDER Q. HUERTA	2623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 February 2006.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-56 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-56 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 21 February 2006 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-4, 6-11, 13-19, 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Schindler et al (United States Patent 5,675,390), herein referenced as Schindler.

Regarding **claim 1**, Schindler discloses “an audio/video signal processing apparatus (personal computer 118) for a plurality of different audio and/or video signal processing operations (Col. 3 lines 34-48, Fig. 1 El. 118) with a housing (Col. 3 lines 54-58, i.e. chassis of computer), a central unit (Col. 8 line 66-Col. 9 line 4, Fig. 3, i.e. PC system board) arranged in the housing, a plurality of signal processing modules provided in the housing for audio and/or video signal processing operations (Fig. 3 El. 316, 318, 320, 321) and a control unit” (Fig. 1 El. 124). The central unit (PC system board) comprises:

“a processor (processor 310) for the execution of computing operations for an audio and/or video signal processing operation in accordance with an activated signal processing module of the plurality of signal processing modules” (Col. 9 lines 31-44, Fig. 3),

“an archiving device for storing audio and video signals” (Col. 9 lines 45-50, Fig. 3 El. 332),

“a man-machine interface (Fig. 3 El. 314, 316, 318, 324, 310, i.e. Schindler teaches the components which constitute a man-machine interface) with a device (VGA/Video 318) for generating a display signal for a common visual user guidance of the audio and/or video signal processing operations of the plurality of signal processing modules (Col. 4 lines 45-47, Col. 11 lines 13-37, Col. 18 line 57-Col. 19 line 4, Figs. 3, 5, 14a), a device for detecting user operations from the control unit for the control of the audio and/or video signal processing (Col. 9 lines 24-30 Fig. 3 El. 324) and a device (350) for the respective control of one of the signal processing modules” (Col. 9 lines 34-30, i.e. ISA board), and

“an I/O communication interface for receiving audio and/or video signals to be processed and for the output of audio and/or video signals including the display signal for the visual user guidance on a display” (Col. 12, lines 22-45, Fig. 7 El. 710).

Regarding **claim 2**, Schindler discloses that “the archiving device is a hard disk drive” (Col. 9 lines 61-66, Fig. 3 El. 332).

Regarding **claim 3**, Schindler discloses that “the I/O communication interface comprises connections for at least one of the interface standards PCI, USB, Firewire or **RS232** for a wireless and/or wire-connected LAN/WLAN network and/or for the Internet an analogue modem, an ISDN connection or an ADSL connection” (Col. 5 lines 15-24, i.e. RS232).

Regarding **claim 4**, Schindler discloses that "the I/O communication interface is of modular construction" (Col. 3 lines 54-58, Col. 8 line 66-Col. 9 line 4, i.e. PCI bus).

Regarding **claim 6**, Schindler discloses that "the I/O communication interface contains at least one output connection for a television apparatus or a monitor for the display of a video signal" (Col. 8 lines 19-29, Col. 12 lines 34-35, Fig. 7 El. 522).

Regarding **claim 7**, Schindler discloses that "the device for the generation of a display signal is an on-screen display unit" (Col. 4 lines 45-47, Col. 11 lines 13-37, Col. 18 line 57-Col. 19 line 4, Fig. 3 El. 18, Fig. 14a, i.e. the VGA card circuitry is used to process the video signals to generate and output the user interface).

Regarding **claim 8**, Schindler discloses that "the display signal for the visual user guidance displays a list of menu options" (Col. 18 line 57-Col. 19 line 50, Figs. 14a-f).

Regarding **claim 9**, Schindler discloses that "after powering up a menu for the selection of an audio/video signal processing functionality is displayed" (Col. 18 line 57-Col. 19 line 50, Figs. 14a-f, i.e. one of ordinary skill would recognize that when the menu is power ON that it would display options and data, which meets the limitation "functionality").

Regarding **claim 10**, Schindler discloses that "the control unit (remote control 124) is a selection device for the selection of one of the displayed menu options" (Col. 5 line 63-Col. 6 line 8).

Regarding **claim 11**, Schindler discloses that "the control unit is a remote control unit, in particular a radio remote control unit" (Col. 6 lines 9-12, Col. 8 lines 3-9).

Regarding **claim 13**, Schindler discloses that "the remote control unit contains manually operable scroll keys" (Col. 13 line 61-Col. 14 line 14, Fig. 9A, El. 916, i.e. channel up/down buttons for manually scrolling through channels).

Regarding **claim 14**, Schindler discloses that "the visual user guidance for all signal processing modules is performed via menus" (Col. 18 line 57-Col. 19 line 50, Figs. 14a-f, i.e. the viewer uses the on-screen menus to select and configure the entertainment system).

Regarding **claim 15**, Schindler discloses that "the man-machine interface (Fig. 3 El. 314, 316, 318, 324, 310, i.e. Schindler teaches the components which constitute a man-machine interface) contains a storage device (Fig. 3 El. 314) for storing the status information needed for the user guidance and operation in accordance with the signal processing modules provided in the housing" (Col. 9 lines 30-44, i.e. one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that the memory coupled to the processor would store status information so that the processor could retrieve and execute information to display on the user interface (Figs 14a-f)).

Regarding **claim 16**, Schindler discloses that "the man-machine interface (Fig. 3 El. 314, 316, 318, 324, 310, i.e. Schindler teaches the components which constitute a the claimed "man-machine interface") converts signals received by the control unit (remote control) in accordance with the respectively active signal processing module into module-specific control commands for the respectively active signal processing module" (Col. 9 lines 24-30, i.e. RF receiver takes the commands from the remote control and routes them to the appropriate module).

Regarding **claim 17**, Schindler discloses that “the status information specifies the respectively active signal processing module” (Col. 19 lines 17-36, lines 44-50, Figs. 14b-c, i.e. one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that when the user selects, for instance the CD audio, that it would represent that the CD processing module would be active).

Regarding **claim 18**, Schindler discloses that “the processor of the central unit executes all the audio/video computing operations” (Col. 9 lines 31-44).

Regarding **claim 19**, Schindler discloses that “the processor (processor 310) of the central unit simultaneously processes a plurality of different audio/video computing operations” (Col. 9 lines 31-44, i.e. one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that the processor would have to process audio and video signals simultaneously in order to timely display the playback of the program).

Regarding **claim 38**, Schindler discloses that “a signal processing module (Fig. 3 El. 318) emulates the audio and/or video signal application of a conventional audio or video apparatus” (Col. 3 lines 34-48, Col.11 lines 16-37).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schindler, in view of Tsai (United States Patent 6,466,434), herein referenced as Tsai.

Regarding **claim 5**, Schindler discloses that the “connections of the I/O communication interface are arranged for a permanent apparatus connection on the back of the housing (Fig. 7, El. 712, 548, 546).

Schindler fails to explicitly disclose “connections of the I/O communication interface are arranged for a temporary apparatus connection on the front of the housing”.

Tsai discloses “connections of the I/O communication interface are arranged for a temporary apparatus connection on the front of the housing” (Col. 3 lines 54-64, Fig. 4 El. 47). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the technique of having I/O ports of the front of the computer housing as taught by Tsai, to improve the home entertainment system of Schindler for the predictable result of enabling the user the convenience of easily connecting a/v appliances to the front of the computer temporarily without having to reach behind the computer.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schindler in view of Wolf et al. (United States Patent Application 2003/0006346), herein referenced as Wolf.

Regarding **claim 12**, Schindler discloses that "...the selection of one of the displayed menu options" (Col. 5 lines63-Col. 6 line 8).

Schindler fails to explicitly disclose that “the remote control unit contains a manually operable rotating wheel”

Wolf discloses that “the remote control unit contains a manually operable rotating wheel” ([0064], Fig. 2 El. 161). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the technique of using a thumb wheel on a remote to scroll through menus as taught by Wolf, to improve the home entertainment system of Schindler for the predictable result of enabling the user the convenience of easily and efficiently scrolling through menu options with out the burden of manually pushing a variety of buttons.

Claims 20-21, 23-24, 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schindler in view of Davis et al. (United States Patent 6,356,435), herein referenced as Davis.

Regarding **claim 20**, Schindler fails to explicitly disclose “a fan for passing cooling air over a component of the audio/video signal processing apparatus”.

Davis discloses “a fan for passing cooling air over a component of the audio/video signal processing apparatus (CPU)” (Col. 3 lines 13-17, Fig. 2). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the technique of using fan to blow cool air over a processor as taught by Davis, to improve the home entertainment system of Schindler for the predictable result of preventing the CPU from over heating and dissipating the heat generated by the CPU.

Regarding **claim 21**, Schindler fails to explicitly disclose that “the fan is a processor fan for passing cooling air over the processor”.

Davis discloses that “the fan is a processor fan for passing cooling air over the processor” (Col. 3 lines 13-17, Fig. 2). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art to apply the technique of using fan to blow cool air over a processor as taught by Davis, to improve the home entertainment system of Schindler for the predictable result of preventing the CPU from over heating and dissipating the heat generated by the CPU.

Regarding **claim 23**, Schindler fails to explicitly disclose that "the fan is arranged directly on the housing".

Davis discloses that "the fan is arranged directly on the housing" (Col. 3 lines 13-17, Fig. 2). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the technique of attaching a fan to the computer housing as taught by Davis, to improve the home entertainment system of Schindler for the predictable result of preventing the CPU from over heating and providing extra spacing within the housing.

Regarding **claim 24**, Schindler fails to explicitly disclose "an air duct for the connection of the fan to the housing for the feeding of external air to the component to be cooled".

Davis discloses "an air duct (air duct 72) for the connection of the fan to the housing for the feeding of external air to the component to be cooled" (Col. 4 lines 57-65, Fig. 4A). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the technique of connecting an air duct to a fan as taught by Davis, to improve the home entertainment system of Schindler for the predictable result of drawing cooler air into the housing and preventing the CPU from over heating.

Regarding **claim 26**, Schindler fails to explicitly disclose that "the processor fan exhibits a larger cross-section than the processor", however the examiner takes

OFFICIAL NOTICE of the fact that it was well known in the art to have a processor fan with a larger cross section than the processor. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Schindler by specifically providing a processor fan with a larger cross section than the processor, for the purpose of allowing more air to be dissipated by the larger fan blades of the processor fan.

Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schindler in view of Davis and in further view of Schmitt et al. (United States Patent 6,040,981), herein referenced as Schmitt.

Regarding **claim 22**, Schindler fails to explicitly disclose that "the fan is a power supply unit fan for passing cooling air over the power supply unit".

Schmitt discloses "the fan is a power supply unit fan for passing cooling air over the power supply unit" (Col. 1 lines 15-22, lines 30-38, lines 52-60, Figs. 2-6). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the technique of using fan to blow cool air over a power supply as taught by Schmitt, to improve the home entertainment system of Schindler for the predictable result of preventing the power supply from over heating and dissipating the heat generated by the power supply.

Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schindler in view of Davis and in further view of Hughes (United States Patent 4,730,980), herein referenced as Hughes.

Regarding **claim 25**, Schindler fails to explicitly disclose that “the air duct exhibits a conical shape”.

Davis discloses and air for connection with a fan (Col. 4 lines 57-65, Fig. 4A, however fails to disclose that the air duct is conical in shape.

Hughes discloses that an air duct is “conical” (Col. 1 line 65-Col. 2 line17). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the technique of using a conical fan air duct as taught by Hughes, to improve the home entertainment system of Schindler for the predictable result of preventing the power supply from over heating and efficiently bringing in cooler outside air.

Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schindler in view of Davis, and in further view of Nelson (United States Patent 5,339,214), herein referenced as Nelson.

Regarding **claim 27**, Schindler fails to explicitly disclose that “the processor fan exhibits a cross-section larger than 45x45mm”.

Nelson discloses that “the processor fan exhibits a cross-section larger than 45x45mm” (Col. 2 lines 42-50). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the technique of using a fan with a cross section larger than 45x45mm as taught by Nelson, to improve the home entertainment system of Schindler for the predictable result of allowing more hot air to be dissipated by the larger processor fan blades.

Claims 28-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schindler in view of Davis and in further view of Nair (United States Patent 6,318,965), herein referenced as Nair.

Regarding **claim 28**, Schindler fails to explicitly disclose that "the fan is operated with a rotational speed slower than 3000 rpm".

Nair discloses that "the fan is operated with a rotational speed slower than 3000 rpm" (Col. 1 lines 26-36). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the technique of operating the fan at a rpm lower than 3000 rpm as taught by Nair, to improve the home entertainment system of Schindler for the predictable result of preventing excessive noise and power consumption if the temperature of the CPU does not require the extra cooling.

Regarding **claim 29**, Schindler fails to explicitly discloses that "the rotational speed of the fan is controlled in accordance with the temperature of the component to be cooled, in particular of the processor or of the power supply unit".

Nair discloses that "the rotational speed of the fan is controlled in accordance with the temperature of the component to be cooled, in particular of the processor or of the power supply unit" (Col. 1 lines 26-36, Col. 2 line 52-65). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the technique of operating the fan in accordance with the temperature as taught by Nair, to improve the home entertainment system of Schindler for the predictable result of preventing excessive noise and power consumption if the temperature of the CPU does not require the extra cooling.

Claims 30-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schindler in view of Bruner et al. (United States Patent 6,831,830), herein referenced as Bruner.

Regarding **claim 30**, Schindler fails to explicitly disclose that "the mechanical drives provided in the housing are mounted via damping elements".

Bruner discloses that "the mechanical drives provided in the housing are mounted via damping elements" (Col. 1 lines 24-41, i.e. rubber grommets). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the technique of mounting the mechanical drives with rubber damping elements as taught by Bruner, to improve the home entertainment system of Schindler for the predictable result of preventing mechanical shock on the hard drive.

Regarding **claim 31**, Schindler discloses that "the mechanical drive is an optical drive, in particular a DVD drive or a CD drive or a **hard disk drive**" (Col. 9 lines 61-66, Fig. 3 El. 332).

Regarding **claim 32**, Schindler fails to explicitly disclose that "the damping elements are made of rubber" (Col. 1 lines 24-41, i.e. rubber grommets). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the technique of mounting the mechanical drives with rubber damping elements as taught by Bruner, to improve the home entertainment system of Schindler for the predictable result of preventing mechanical shock on the hard drive.

Claim 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schindler in view of Bruner, and in further view of Curtis et al. (United States Patent Application Publication 2003/0011981), herein referenced as Curtis.

Regarding **claim 33**, Schindler fails to explicitly disclose that “the mechanical drive can be inserted into the housing via a plastic rail and the plastic rail is mounted on the mechanical drive via rubber buffers”.

Bruner discloses that “the rail (mounting bridge) is mounted via rubber buffers (rubber grommets)” (Col. 1 lines 24-41). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the technique of mounting the mechanical drives with rubber damping elements as taught by Bruner, to improve the home entertainment system of Schindler for the predictable result of preventing mechanical shock on the hard drive.

The combination of Schindler and Bruner still fail to explicitly disclose that “the mechanical drive can be inserted into the housing via a plastic rail and the plastic rail is mounted on the mechanical drive...”.

Curtis discloses that “the mechanical drive can be inserted into the housing via a plastic rail and the plastic rail is mounted on the mechanical drive...” [0041]. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the technique of mounting the mechanical drives with plastic rails as taught by Curtis, to improve the home entertainment system of Schindler for the predictable result of increasing the hard drives ability to withstand shock and vibration.

Claims 34-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schindler in view of Kitlas et al. (United States Patent 5,852,547), herein referenced as Kitlas.

Regarding **claim 34**, Schindler fails to explicitly disclose that "the housing comprises a plurality of slots for the insertion of signal processing modules in the form of plug-in cards and a plurality of slide-in slots for the insertion of mechanical drives".

Kitlas discloses that "the housing comprises a plurality of slots for the insertion of signal processing modules in the form of plug-in cards (Fig. 1 El. 35) and a plurality of slide-in slots for the insertion of mechanical drives (Fig. 1 El 32, 34)" (Col. 3 lines 31-35). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the technique of using a plurality of PCI slots and slide-slots as taught by Kitlas, to improve the home entertainment system of Schindler for the predictable result of allowing the user to easily expand the media PC by adding peripherals and drives.

Regarding **claim 35**, Schindler discloses that "the plug-in and slide-in slots each conform to a standard form factor" (Col. 4 lines 1-4, Fig. 3 El. 312, i.e. PCI Bus).

Regarding **claim 36**, Schindler discloses that "the standard form factor for signal processing modules is the PCI standard, the Mini PCI standard and/or the AGP standard" (Col. 4 lines 1-4, Fig. 3 El. 312, i.e. PCI Bus).

Regarding **claim 37**, Schindler fails to explicitly disclose that "the standard form factor for mechanical drives is the 51/4 inch standard, the 3.5" standard, the 3" standard or the 2.5" standard". However, the examiner takes OFFICIAL NOTICE of the fact that it

was well known in the art to provide mechanical drives in the standard form factor of 51/4 inch standard, the 3.5" standard, the 3" standard or the 2.5" standard.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Schindler by specifically providing the standard form factor for mechanical drives is the 51/4 inch standard, the 3.5" standard, the 3" standard or the 2.5" standard, for the purpose of ensuring that the mechanical drives conform to the industry standard size so that they fit within the housing bays.

Claims 39-43, 47-54, 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schindler.

Regarding **claim 39**, Schindler discloses that "the signal processing modules arranged in the housing comprise a television module (tuner 526), a video module (VGA card 318), a CD/DVD module (CD ROM drive 334), an audio module (sound card 320), a radio module (RF receiver 324), a photographic module (video camera 1532) and/or a recording module" (Figs. 3, 5, 15).

Regarding a CD/DVD module. Schindler fails to explicitly disclose a CD/DVD module, however the examiner takes OFFICIAL NOTICE of the fact that it was well known in the art to provide a CD/DVD module. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Schindler by specifically providing a CD/DVD drive, for the purpose of allowing the user the convenience combining the functionality of a CD drive and a DVD drive into a single drive to save space.

Regarding **claim 40**, Schindler discloses that “the television module is an **analogue television module** and/or a digital television module” (Col. 11 lines 38-45, i.e. NTSC).

Regarding **claim 41**, Schindler discloses that “the television module is an analogue television module for the reception of television signals according to the NTSC, PAL and/or SECAM standard” (Col. 11 lines 38-45, i.e. NTSC).

Regarding **claim 42**, Schindler discloses that “the television module is a digital television module for the reception of television signals according to the DVB standard” (Col. 3 lines 49-61).

Regarding **claim 43**, Schindler discloses that “the television module is configured for the reception of television signals transmitted via satellite, cable and/or terrestrially” (Col. 3 lines 49-61).

Regarding **claim 47**, Schindler discloses that "the recording module allows a recording of data on an optical storage, in particular a CD, DVD or HD-DVD" (Col. 21 19-25). Schindler fails to explicitly disclose recording of data on DVD, however the examiner takes OFFICIAL NOTICE of the fact that it was well known in the art to record data on a DVD. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Schindler by specifically providing recording data on a DVD, for the purpose of allowing the user to write data on a DVD, which provides more storage capabilities compared to a CD.

Regarding **claim 48**, Schindler discloses that “the recording module is able to display data recorded on the optical storage medium and is also able to record data on the optical storage medium” (Col. 21 19-25).

Regarding **claim 49**, Schindler discloses that “the recording module is a magnetic storage drive, in particular a hard disk drive, a Minidisc drive or a flash memory drive” (Col. 9 lines 45-50, lines 61-66). Schindler fails to explicitly disclose a Minidisc drive, however the examiner takes OFFICIAL NOTICE of the fact that it was well known in the art to provide a Minidisc drive. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Schindler by specifically providing Minidisc drive, for the purpose of allowing the user to record audio on a medium that prevents disc skipping.

Regarding **claim 50**, Schindler discloses that “the video module (VGA card 318) is set up for the decoding of coded audio and/or video data and/or for the coding of audio and/or video data” (Col. 11 lines 16-23).

Regarding **claim 51**, Schindler discloses that “the video module is set up for the processing of video signals according to the coding standard MPEG, DVC-Pro, H.26x., JPEG, Motion-JPEG, and/or JPEG-2000 and/or for the processing of audio signals according to the standard MP3, WMA, AC3 and/or AVI” (Col. 11 lines 16-37, i.e. MPEG). Schindler fails to explicitly disclose that the video module processes video signals according to DVC-Pro, H.26x., JPEG, and Motion-JPEG, however the examiner takes OFFICIAL NOTICE of the fact that it was well known in the art to process video signals according to DVC-Pro, H.26x., JPEG, and Motion-JPEG. Therefore, it would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Schindler by specifically providing a video module that processes video signals according to DVC-Pro, H.26x., JPEG, and Motion-JPEG, for the purpose of enabling the user the convenience of being able to watch various video formats.

Regarding **claim 52**, Schindler discloses that “the audio module is set up for the decoding of coded audio data and/or for the coding of audio data” (Col. 12 lines 1-7, Fig. 6, El. 616).

Regarding **claim 53**, Schindler discloses that “the audio module is set up for the processing of audio signals according to one of the standards MP3, WMA, AC3, and/or AVI” (Col. 11 lines 29-31, Col. 12 lines 1-21, i.e. Schindler teaches the use of MPEG format which includes MP3 audio compression).

Regarding **claim 54**, Schindler discloses that “the video module and/or the audio module is set up for the archiving of video and/or audio data” (Col. 3 lines 34-48, Col. 21 lines 19-25, i.e. one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that the VGA card 318 would be set up to decode and process incoming television signals to enable recording of the television programming).

Regarding **claim 56**, Schindler discloses that “the I/O communication interface comprises an output connection for consumer electronic apparatuses, in particular a SCART, composite and/or S-Video connection” (Fig. 5 El. 546). Schindler fails to explicitly disclose a SCART connection, however the examiner takes OFFICIAL NOTICE of the fact that it was well known in the art to provide a SCART connection. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to modify Schindler by specifically providing SCART connection, for the purpose of providing the user the convenience of connector that gathers together various common analog signal types into a single connector.

Claims 44-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schindler in view of Reams (United States Patent 5,907,793), herein referenced as Reams.

Regarding **claim 44**, Schindler fails to explicitly disclose that “the television module is configured for the processing of HDTV signals”

Reams discloses “the television module (digital tuner) is configured for the processing of HDTV signals” (Col. 6 lines 51-56). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the technique of processing HDTV signals as taught by Reams, to improve the home entertainment system of Schindler for the predictable result of allowing the user to view television in high definition which provides a much higher resolution than standard television.

Regarding **claim 45**, Schindler fails to explicitly disclose that “the radio module is analog and/or digital radio module”.

Reams discloses “the radio module (digital tuner) is analog and/or digital radio module” (Col. 6 lines 51-56). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the technique of providing a digital radio module as taught by Reams, to improve the home entertainment system of Schindler for the predictable result of allowing the user to receive higher quality digital radio broadcasts.

Regarding **claim 46**, Schindler fails to explicitly disclose that “the radio module is set up for the processing of radio signals transmitted according to the DAB standard”.

Reams discloses that “the radio module is set up for the processing of radio signals transmitted according to the DAB standard” (Col. 6 lines 51-56). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the technique of processing signals according to the DAB standard as taught by Reams, to improve the home entertainment system of Schindler for the predictable result of allowing the user to receive higher quality digital radio broadcasts using DAB standard.

Claim 55 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schindler in view of Wang et al. (United States Patent 7,197,544), herein referenced as Wang.

Regarding **claim 55**, Schindler discloses that “the photographic module is able to code,...” (Col. 20 lines 59-64, i.e. decode).

Schindler fails to explicitly disclose that “the photographic module is able to... edit and archive picture data”.

Wang discloses that “the photographic module is able to... edit and archive picture data” (Col. 6 line 64-Col. 5 line 6, i.e. Wang discloses that a webcam can edit and record picture data). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the technique using a webcam to edit and record picture data as taught by Wang, to improve the home entertainment system of Schindler for the predictable result of allowing the user to record and edit pictures according to their preferences.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ALEXANDER Q. HUERTA whose telephone number is (571) 270-3582. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F(Alternate Fridays Off) 7:30-5:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Scott Beliveau can be reached on (571) 272-7343. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Alexander Q Huerta
Examiner
Art Unit 2623

September 15, 2008

/Scott Beliveau/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2623